



GOD SAVE US FROM SOME "FRIENDS"

BY WILLIAM HENRY CHAMBERLIN

"But of all plagues, good Heaven, thy wrath can send,
"Save, save, O save me from the candid friend."

THE AUTHOR of these lines is George Canning, a minor poet as well as a major diplomat. In his capacity as British Foreign Minister during and after the Napoleonic Wars he had ample reason to feel strengthened in this belief that an open enemy is preferable to a lukewarm or insincere alleged friend.

Americans can well share this feeling. We have already lost too many points in the great game of international diplomacy by paying undue attention to the views and objections of "friends" who, when the chips are down, are usually found in the enemy's corner. How often, during the fighting in Korea, we were warned by faint-hearts and appeasers in this country and abroad to do nothing that might offend the sensitive nerves of Prime Minister Nehru of India.

Nehru did not put a man or a gun on the Korean front. But he was extremely generous with defeatist advice, of the backseat driving variety. And he has been playing the same role, behind the scenes, at Geneva, strengthening the British impulse to remain passive, do nothing and twiddle thumbs diplomatically while international Communism threatens to achieve its biggest breakthrough since the conquest of China.

There was a similar outcry from Chester Bowles, New Deal Governor of Connecticut and Ambassador to India and a leading light in the ADA, and others of the same school of thought when the issue of American military aid to Pakistan came up. Pakistan, among Asiatic countries, has been one of the friendliest, from the standpoint of United States foreign policy. Its recent pact of friendship with Turkey, a staunch bastion in the eastern Mediterranean, has helped to plug a big hole in the anti-Communist front in the Near and Middle East.

But there was clamor, fortunately in this case disregarded, that American military aid to Pakistan should be dropped because of Nehru's objections. Nehru himself, had not only refused to enter into any military understanding with the United States, but instructed his delegate in the "neutral" repatriation commission to vote for the continued detention of the sorely tried anti-Communist North Korean and Chinese prisoners.

IT HAS BECOME a recognized device of those who oppose a firm, logical, consistent anti-Communist line in foreign policy to invoke the spectre of "friends" in foreign parts who will be alienated by any action along such a line. A special expert in what might be called this "friends" chorus is Vera Micheles Dean, editor of the *Foreign Policy Bulletin*, published by the foundation-subsidized Foreign Policy Association. The following quotations from an article by Mrs. Dean, "Ends and Means in World Affairs," of October 15, 1953, show how these anonymous and probably imaginary "friends" are utilized as a convenient vehicle of expression for the writer's own anti-anti-Communist views: "The friends of the United States abroad heard both Mr. Stevenson and Mr. Dulles with relief and approval . . . Any indication of rigidity on the part of the United States makes our friends abroad fear that the Eisenhower Administration may miss an historic opportunity to ease global tensions. . . . Our friends, for their part, are so preoccupied with internal problems and with fear of another war. . . .

"Even those of our friends abroad who understand and deeply sympathize with us in our losses nevertheless ask whether some of the methods the United States is now using will actually achieve the objective of stabilizing the world and thereby safeguarding this country from future experiences like that of Korea . . . Over the long run, is it not possible, they [these much cited "friends"] say, that the United States may be storing up new problems for tomorrow? Are Americans certain that Dr. Adenauer's West Germany is a genuine democracy, which will not threaten France and Russia as Kaiser and Hitler Germany did in the past? Will the aid of General Franco lose us more in terms of moral support among those who believe in Democracy than we can gain in terms of bases?"

And so on, and so on, with two more references to these unnamed "friends" in one comparatively short article. It would certainly seem, from the views attributed to them, that these "friends" are, if not Communists and fellow-travelers, at the very least neutralists with a singularly biased and unrealistic outlook on world affairs.

What an absurd suggestion, for instance, that disarmed West Germany would now or in any predictable future be in a position to "threaten" the Soviet Union, the most heavily armed power in the world. And what a misrepresentation of the facts of the case, what an assist to Soviet propaganda to intimate that American "rigidity" is the obstacle to easing global tensions, as if Communist negotiators had established a reputation for amiable, flexible, give-and-take dealing.

It is worthwhile to take an occasional peek at the views that are being expressed in the official organ of one of the most influential American organizations devoted to the study of foreign affairs.

UNDOUBTEDLY THERE ARE people in Asia and in Europe with the views which Mrs. Dean attributes to our "friends." But it seems grossly inaccurate to regard these people as friendly to this country. And it seems a grave disservice to America's national

interests to take the advice of neutralists with a more or less pronounced sympathy with the Communist point of view in preference to that of militant anti-Communists of proved loyalty.

Why, in the name of common sense, should Nehru, as head of a nation of 300 million people, and whose contribution to the Korean War was an ambulance unit and a few jute bags, rate more influence on decisions in Washington than Syngman Rhee and Chiang Kai-shek, who put everything they had into the struggle? It is high time to distinguish genuine friends, who deserve as much support as we can afford, from false friends who persist in coming up with slick compromise schemes that always work out to the advantage of the Kremlin.

In Europe, as in Asia, Americans may well pray to be delivered from "candid friends" whose advice always adds up to retreat or surrender. A good example is Aneurin Bevan, who periodically takes time out from his efforts to oust the relatively moderate leadership of the Labor party in order to lecture America on the error of her ways in foreign affairs.

Perhaps, in the days of Alger Hiss and Harry Dexter White, Bevan might have got a job as consultant for the State Department. Even now he has his uses, as an adviser-in-reverse. We shall seldom go wrong if we do the precise opposite of whatever Mr. Bevan may advocate.

Bevan and the left wing Laborites for whom he speaks, together with likeminded groups in France and Italy, would have us recognize Red China. They oppose American bases in Spain and German rearmament. Their ideal in Western-Soviet relations is give-and-take, with the Soviet Union doing all the taking and the West (especially the United States) doing all the giving. The writings of Mr. Alvarez del Vayo in *The Nation* supply excellent illustrative material on the viewpoint of these "friends."

It is a point worth noting that the persons in this country and abroad who profess to be shocked by our agreement for the grant of economic and military aid in exchange for the use of Spanish bases were, with few if any exceptions, enthusiastic over our far more dangerous association with the Soviet Union during the war. This is surely a case for the application of the Biblical proverbs about the mote and the beam, about straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel.

One need not whitewash or gloss over any of the harsh authoritarian features of the Franco regime to recognize that its cruelties and repression have been child's play, by comparison with the permanent reign of terror in the Soviet empire. And there is still stronger practical consideration, from the standpoint of American national interest.

Under no conceivable circumstances could Spain under Franco or Franco's successor become the grave threat to American security now represented by the Soviet Union, thanks in large measure to the appeasement policy followed by this country and Great Britain at Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam. Americans have reason to be happy that after the civil war Franco, and not some stooge of Moscow, was in power in Spain. If Spain had become a "people's democracy" it would today be a natural Typhoid Mary for spreading germs of Communist subversion and anti-United States feeling all over Latin America. In that case we should probably have had more than one Guatemala to worry about.

THE ISSUE OF GERMAN rearmament within the framework of EDC or NATO boils down to a simple question. Should we sacrifice the friendly, pro-Western government of Chancellor Adenauer to our outright enemies, the Soviets, and to "friends" of the Bevanite type? Adenauer has brought Germany back a long way from the economic despair and the cynical political neutralism that prevailed a few years ago.

A year ago he received a decisive vote of confidence in a free national election for his policy of placing co-operation with the West ahead of German national unity, if such had to be achieved by submission to Moscow. But Adenauer's policy calls for a reciprocity that has not been forthcoming. France has been stalling for more than two years on ratifying the European Defense Community treaty without offering any substitute.

If one calls the role of opponents of German rearming, the one sure and effective means of building up a balance of power against the Soviet Union, one finds: (a) Communists; (b) Fellow-travellers, left wing socialists and neutralists with a strong anti-American bias; (c) People whose political thinking stopped with the last war, who have learned nothing and forgotten nothing from the unvarying pattern of Communist aggression. Between Adenauer's farsighted European policy and the pro-Communist, neutralist or merely negative views of his critics there should be little difficulty in making a choice.

The sensible thing is to judge friends by deeds, not words, and allies by their practical contributions to the anti-Communist cause. When we encounter a situation where a choice is necessary we should give our preference to the governments that are going our way, that feel as we do about the reality of the Communist threat and are prepared to back up this feeling with action. Let our neutralist "friends" go their own way and shift for themselves, without American military or economic subsidies. This is not undue pressure. This is common sense promotion of our national interest: the only reliable guide in foreign policy.

HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor*

Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, WILLIS J. BALLINGER

Vol. XI, No. 38

Wednesday, September 22, 1954

Washington, D. C.

Aftermath of Maine: Second thoughts during seven days have generated rather than dissipated qualms about the GOP reverse in the Pine Tree State. Republican circles now concede privately that their party may lose the Senate and is likely to lose perhaps 30 seats in the House — unless drastic measures are taken.

What has deepened the gloom and prevented any attempt to discount the reduction of Republican votes in Maine are the private, expert surveys conducted throughout the country. This column has had the benefit of such a report from a veteran Republican whose specialty has been that of a “trouble-shooter” in off-year elections and who has just returned from a trip across the continent. He says that everywhere, numerous conservative Republicans are in a mood to stay at home on election day; and he estimates this movement sufficient to cause a debacle. After talking with hundreds of people during his journey, he believes that they would respond to a patriotic appeal, that they crave a leader who would evoke the love of country and assertion of American power and rights. The only man who touches this chord is Senator Knowland.

Analytically, the diagnosis seems to be best set down by the Dunn Survey (of Greenwich, Conn.) which said recently: “If the voters now believe the Administration is accepting and extending the New Deal’s welfare-socialist programs, disappointment would cause many Eisenhower voters to remain away from the polls in November, resulting in the probable defeat for the Republican party in the congressional election.” Also, some recall a book, *How Not To Run for President*, by James L. Wick, published during the 1952 nominating campaign. The author said: “After the 1940, 1944 and 1948 defeats, the Republican party ought to be cured of choosing nominees whose acceptance speech can be summed up in 23 words: ‘Having nominated me you Republicans are trapped. You have nowhere else to go. Now sit back and watch me win New Deal votes.’”

Today, election experts here no longer think in terms of “winning New Deal votes.” They agree that something must be done to arouse the Republican conservatives from their “stay-at-home” attitude. Vice President Nixon has sought, during the past week, to meet this problem by attacking “Trumanism.” This could conceivably help, if the Eisenhower Administration would act as well as talk against “Trumanism.”

Where — it is asked — is the startling muck-raking campaign by Attorney General Brownell which has been so often forecast in recent months? And why doesn’t the Department of Justice produce an expose as striking as that launched a year ago on Truman and Harry Dexter White? Senator McCarthy’s statement the other day that he would make few speeches during the campaign and concentrate instead on committee investigation of corruption and Communism seems to hold more promise of supplying the remedy for the “Maine hangover.”

Political Talk: Len Hall, National Chairman of the GOP, is the subject of much sympathy in party circles in Washington. It is known that the White House staff gives him somewhat less than eager cooperation and that he has a difficult time seeing the President. He works hard trying to obtain Executive appointments for the party, but even what small success he achieves comes only after Herculean labors. He has accomplished some favors for the Right wing, but these are little publicized. Meanwhile, the

"big money" is not going through the coffers of Len Hall's National Committee but directly to congressional candidates in the field. And now there is a rumor that the White House assistants are laying plans to oust Hall after the election.

● The movement against GOP Senatorial candidate Case in New Jersey has gained so much momentum that leaders discuss a write-in campaign for former Congressman Fred Hartley, although voting-machines would make such a course difficult. Leaders also are talking of welding their followers into a permanent movement to continue work after the election. Some think such an organization should be within the framework of the Republican party; others — noting the large numbers of Democratic rebels — talk of the creation of a "conservative ADA."

● Meek's campaign in Illinois, from all reports, is going strong. His attacks on the socialistic record of his opponent, Democratic Senator Paul Douglas, have won away from the latter many conservatives, Republican and Democratic, who had been his supporters in the previous election, in 1948.

● News from Colorado scarcely suggests that Ike's sojourn in Denver has helped his party in that state. Word comes that Democratic Sen. Ed Johnson, now running for Governor in Colorado, should win and sweep with him most of the rest of the ticket, including the senatorial candidate.

Labor and States Rights: Assistant Secretary of Commerce Lothair Teetor looms as a real fighter for traditional Americanism within the Administration as a result of a verbal tilt with the CIO, during the past few days. On September 10, he delivered a speech to the State Chambers of Commerce at Kansas City, saying that the recent action of Congress in broadening coverage of the unemployment compensation law was a loss for "conservative states-righters" and that the matter should have been left up to the states.

In the same speech, Teetor advocated that Congress should reduce taxes on high income, abolish the excess profits renegotiation setup as a "costly nuisance to industry and amend the Taft-Hartley law to give states more leeway in handling labor-management affairs." This is not the first time that the Department of Commerce has produced courageous words and action. It is recalled that a year ago the Department scotched an attempt by White House Aide Bernard Shanley to promote drastic revision of the Taft-Hartley Act in a way unfavorable to employers.

Teetor's speech in the past 48 hours has received a barrage of abuse from labor. The CIO *News* labels the speech as a "bold effort by the most conservative section of big business to gain control over all Administration policy on labor-management relations" and the labor organ audaciously demands that President Eisenhower should discharge — "and quick" — the Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

Portrait of an Ally: That NATO is coming apart at the seams by reason of acts of our European Allies is all too apparent. Latest evidence of the futility of relying on such Allies to oppose the Russian menace comes from Norway (a NATO Ally) and is reported by Ludwell Denny, the able Scripps-Howard Foreign Editor.

Denny reports the "lack of NATO reinforcements for the fine but small Norwegian air force" because of the "Oslo policy of no-foreign-forces-in-Norway." He says that "Soviet espionage is so penetrating that the Moscow radio frequently broadcasts Norway's latest 'defense secrets'" and that "sometimes this happens within a few hours after Oslo makes a supposedly guarded security decision."

"Equally serious" continues Denny "is the fact that most Norwegians who are not Communists are friendly towards Russia" and that "American distrust of Russia is damned in Norway as McCarthyism which they see as potential Fascism at home and abroad."

Correspondent Denny is frankly bewildered by the situation he describes. He wonders "how such a courageous and democratic people as the Norwegians" can possibly trust Russia with the "Soviet record of tyranny at home and aggression against virtually all of her neighbors."

But most incomprehensible of all to Denny is how Norway which suffered most from a Fifth column in World War II (these traitors were called "Quislings" and Norway was taken from the inside through the services of 60,000 of such traitors) "can now be so indifferent to the 90,000 Norwegian Communists who are subject to Kremlin control."

This week, it is noted here in Washington, Norway voted with the pro-Soviet bloc on the issue of Red China's admission to the UN.

Who Do You Know: Or should it be whom? Anyhow, you know at least one person who ought to be reading HUMAN EVENTS. Send us his name and address, so that we may contact him. A hundred names would be better. (We promise not to mention your name in writing prospects.)

State Department: One of the feelings which oppressed members of Congress as they departed for home last month was that the same old crowd in the State Department which produced the Acheson policy is still in the saddle. Undersecretaries may come and go, but the "directors" and chiefs of this and that division and their assistants remain. They are the ones who write the reports and recommendations for the Secretary, Under Secretary and Assistant Secretaries and they shape policy.

In July 1953, this column obtained the State Department telephone directory of that month and compared its classified section to that of November 1952, when Acheson still ruled. On July 29, 1953, we reported that the pages "with only minor changes, mirror the old setup under Acheson." Our published observations caused no little comment on Capitol Hill at the time. This year in July, when we sought a copy of the 1954 book, we were told that it was not issued yet and anyway, no copies were to be given outside the Department. Late in August, a source in the White House obtained for us a directory marked August 1954. When asked about a month's delay in issuance, he replied: "I believe they wanted to wait until Congress had gone home."

Again we found ourselves reading most of the same old names which adorned the directory of November 1952. The Executive Secretariat has a Director, a Deputy and Executive Officer who were there under Acheson. So has the Reports and Operations Staff; the same goes for the Division of Foreign Reporting and the Office of Budget Reports, as well as the Office of Communications and Records. Similarly, familiar names appear in the Bureau of UN Affairs. Sometimes a name in the 1952 directory seems to be missing in the 1954 edition, but search reveals that the same man is in some other position. In the very important Economic Affairs Division, there are few differences apart from the Assistant Secretary. Among the chiefs of the highly important Policy Planning Division, two of the names are different today, but one of the newcomers is actually an old Acheson hand.

Legion: At the recent convention of the American Legion in Washington, an interesting incident occurred. A resolution was adopted by the Legion Auxiliary's Resolution Committee to "delete" the words "Jesus Christ" from Legion Auxiliary Devotions. The Auxiliary is the women's organization of the Legion. One determined lady hearing about the action of the Auxiliary's Resolution Committee, twenty minutes after it happened, swung into action. At her own expense she called long distance to top religious figures in the nation. The next morning important Christians all over the country had responded and the resolution which omitted mention of "Jesus Christ" in the official prayers of the Legion Auxiliary was withdrawn.

The Truth About The Foundations Probe: The Reece Committee of the House, which sought to investigate foundations, has been balked in its efforts to determine whether these tax-exempt organizations are supporting Fabian socialism in the United States, the objective of both Communists and socialists.

From the origin of the Committee it was clear that every effort would be made to frustrate its activities. Observers reported that one of the major sources of opposition was the White House itself. The Administration frankly expressed its displeasure and Congress responded by cutting the Committee's budget to a point where effective investigative work became extremely difficult.

Chairman Reece (R., Tenn.) has just revealed publicly some of the handicaps under which his Committee labored saying: "In many years of service in the Congress I have never observed a better organized smear campaign against a Congressional Committee nor such wanton distortion of the facts by the public press. The editorials and articles appearing concurrently in the *Daily Worker*, the *New York Times* and *Herald Tribune* would appear to be more than a coincidence."

Chief frustrator on the Committee was Congressman Wayne Hays (D., Ohio) who was reported to have been put on the Committee by House New Dealers. Reece says Hays "interrupted witnesses beyond all reason" — that during one three-hour session Hays "interrupted one witness 246 times." Hays (says Reece) "indulged in intemperate attacks upon the staff and upon the majority of the Committee" and "accused the Chairman (Reece) of lying and being a coward and accused Mr. Goodwin of duplicity and cowardice." Reece continued: "As an example of the Marxian technique of attacking a messenger when the message cannot be attacked," Hays "cast aspersions upon the character and record of a distinguished Catholic nun, the daughter of Senator McCarran whose scholarly work on Fabian socialism in Great Britain had been placed in evidence." Mr. Hays also "characterized an outstanding group of American scholars appearing as Committee witnesses as 'crackpots', 'dredged up' by the Committee."

Congressman Reece will ask the new Congress in January to continue the probe of Foundations; he courageously insists that the public must know whether their vast resources are being used to bring about socialism in America.

World-Wide "Full Employment." The slogan "full employment" keeps cropping up whenever economic and trade conditions receive a going-over. Last year, during the controversy over the Administration's "honest dollar" policy, opponents in the Congress claimed that high interest rates were creating depression and flouting the "full employment" objectives embodied in the Employment Act of 1946. During this month's hearings at the State Department on GATT — the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade — the AFL reiterated its view that GATT should be so operated as to work for "full employment" all over the world.

The AFL suggests that the full-employment goal provided in the 1946 draft of an international trade organization charter (which the U.S. Congress refused to endorse) should be made part of the framework of the formal international trade organization, creation of which will be discussed at the GATT conference in Geneva next November. For the U.S. now to endorse this would be merely to apply the principles of the Employment Act of 1946, AFL argues, adding: "The inclusion of a commitment to full employment would aid us in achieving our own full employment objective and would help to assure that international trade policies would be directed toward the promotion of employment opportunities all over the world."

The AFL premise that "full employment" is the law of our land is mistaken. The conference report on the 1946 Act said: "The term 'full employment' is rejected, and . . . 'maximum employment' is the objective . . ." It also explained the policy as that of using all practical means to maintain conditions wherein, under competitive enterprise, those able, willing and seeking to work might find opportunity for employment. The 1946 Act as passed, differed significantly from the "Full Employment Bill" out of which it grew. To read into the law more than is there is selfdelusion.

Entered as second class matter at the Post Office, Washington, D. C. Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial Subscription, three months for \$3. Six months, \$5.50. One year, \$10. Two years, \$18. First class mail, one year, \$11.00; six months, \$6.00. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, \$12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, \$11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscription or change of address to become effective.